

# **Status Report for the Lincoln Metropolitan Planning Organization on the FHWA/FTA Joint Certification Review of May 5-6, 2009**

*January 29, 2010*

---

## **Background**

The federal Quadrennial Certification Review of the Lincoln Metropolitan Planning Organization (Lincoln MPO) was conducted by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) on May 5-6, 2009. The final report of the “FHWA/FTA Joint Certification Review of the Lincoln Metropolitan Planning Organization” (Final Report) was transmitted by the federal team to the Lincoln MPO on September 11, 2009, and this report was presented to the MPO Officials Committee on September 24, 2009.

The result of this Certification Review included six commendations, seven programmatic recommendations (PRs) and 12 corrective actions (CAs). The federal team conditionally certified the transportation planning process in the Lincoln Metropolitan area with the understanding that the solutions to the CAs will be addressed in a specified time frame and outlined in a federally approved “Action Plan.” Each CA is to have a specific deadline, as well as a specific document that must be provided to the federal team. Although the PRs are not mandatory and do not carry deadlines, the MPO is expected to give serious consideration to full implementation of the PRs.

## **Purpose**

The purpose of this report is to respond to the request received from the FTA and FHWA to provide them with the status of CRs since the federal Certification Review. This is intended to be an interim report on planning activity that has occurred since the Certification Review and to fill the information gaps for the federal team on planning activity until the FTA/FHWA and the Lincoln TMA agree to the required “Corrective Action Plan.”

## **Report Organization**

This report is organized into four sections:

- **Dispositions of Action Items from the 2005 Certification Review.** These are federal review team determinations and notes on the status of each previous programmatic recommendation.
- **Corrective Actions from the 2009 Certification Review.** These are the CAs identified by the federal review team along with notes on the status of the planning activity to be addressed.
- **Programmatic Recommendations.** These are the PRs identified by the federal review team along with notes on the status of the planning activity to be addressed.
- **Commendations or Noteworthy Practices.** Planning activity that the federal review team considered good planning practice.

## Overview of Finding Descriptions

**Corrective Actions:** Those items that fail to meet the requirements of the Federal regulations, seriously impacting the outcome of the overall planning process.

**Programmatic Recommendations:** Items, while somewhat less substantial and not requiring action, that are significant enough that FHWA and FTA would have the State and local officials consider taking some action. Typically the recommendations involve the state of the practice instead of regulatory requirements.

**Commendations or Noteworthy Practices:** Elements that demonstrate well thought out procedures for implementing the planning process.

---

## Dispositions of Certification Review Action Items From the 2005 Planning Review

Recommendations from the previous Certification Review that the federal review team reassessed and made a determination as to the status of each recommendation.

### Programmatic Recommendations:

*1. The MPO's outreach efforts are exemplary. We recommend an evaluation of the effectiveness of the outreach efforts.*

**Current Status:** This recommendation is considered resolved.

*2. We recommend the MPO perform an evaluation of the effectiveness of its Environmental Justice (EJ) efforts. As part of this evaluation, we suggest that the MPO survey low-income and minority communities in the Lincoln metropolitan area for these communities' evaluation of the MPO's EJ efforts.*

**Current Status:** The MPO still needs to perform an evaluation on the effectiveness of its EJ efforts. This recommendation continues.

*Staff Response:* The MPO will complete an evaluation of the effectiveness of its Environmental Justice (EJ) efforts and document findings and address, as needed, future EJ action strategies. Initiate in 2010 with completion by September.

*3. We recommend that all partners in the Lincoln area consider ITS technology as an integral part of every project rather than consideration of such technology being given at or near the end of project design in order to meet a minimum Federal requirement.*

**Current Status:** This recommendation is considered resolved.

**4. After the MPO has rewritten its planning prospectus, we recommend that the MPO, due to its now being a TMA, revisit and (if needed) update the interagency agreements.**

**Current Status:** This recommendation continues as a corrective action.

**Staff Response:** The MPO will initiate this review in January 2010 with a target completion by September 2010.

**5. The MPO needs to proactively institute a method to gain involvement from the freight industry in the transportation planning process.**

**Current Status:** This recommendation continues through the Lincoln MPO's new subcommittee which will include outreach efforts to the freight industry to include in the transportation planning process.

**Staff Response:** This is to be initiated within the LRTP Update process and maintained as an on-going work item in the Metropolitan Transportation Planning process.

**6. The MPO and StarTran are aware of FTA's Access to Jobs program. In the event this program is determined to be beneficial to the Lincoln metropolitan area, the MPO and StarTran are encouraged to first develop an Access to Jobs plan and subsequently pursue and attain Access to Jobs funding from FTA.**

**Current Status:** This recommendation is considered resolved.

**7. The Federal government needs to provide timely information concerning available federal transportation funding to the MPO.**

**Current Status:** This recommendation is considered resolved.

---

## **Dispositions of Certification Review Action Items From FHWA/FTA Joint Certification Review of May 5-6, 2009**

### **Corrective Actions:**

#### **Long Range Transportation Plan**

1. The financial element of the LRTP must be expanded to address the estimated total project costs for "regionally significant" projects and other projects and programs important to the community. To accomplish this, the transportation plan must include:
  - a. details of street and road projects sufficient to assign reasonably expected total costs to those projects,
  - b. descriptions and related estimated costs of proposed non-motorized improvements

- sufficiently significant in scope or cost to list as stand-alone projects, as defined by the MPO,
- c. descriptions and related estimated costs of major ITS/operational improvements,
- d. descriptions of major transit projects proposed over next 20 years, if funding is reasonably expected to be available, and
- e. estimates of expenditures on smaller projects “grouped” into categories covering such activities as surface treatments, landscaping, system preservation, etc.

**Staff Response:** *The MPO is initiating a major update of the LRTP which will address all LRTP CAs. The expected completion is 24 months.*

2. The financial plan element of the LRTP must provide current and forecasted revenues available for projects. The financial element can be included as part of the LRTP or the MPO may include a summary of financial information in the plan document with reference to more detailed information in another separate, but a public document. This needs to include strategies for acquiring any needed additional revenues. The financial element must describe what and how inflation rates have been applied to project cost estimates to meet year of expenditure (YOE) requirements and the assumptions behind choosing those rates. The financial element will also identify the growth rates (positive or negative, which may not necessarily be tied to the cost inflation factors) applied to forecasted revenues available for transportation projects during the life of the plan.

**Staff Response:** *The MPO is initiating a major update of the LRTP which will address all LRTP CAs. The expected completion is 24 months.*

3. The LRTP is required to address environmental mitigation strategies, at least at the regional or systems level. These strategies need to be based on consultation efforts with appropriate natural resource, environmental, land management and similar agencies, and may include results of outreach activities to other environmental interest groups. In addition, the transportation plan is to be compared to State conservation plans or maps or inventories of natural and historic resources, if available.

**Staff Response:** *The MPO is initiating a major update of the LRTP which will address all LRTP CAs. The expected completion is 24 months.*

4. The LRTP needs to identify the areas of their current planning process in which they are coordinating with environmental resources agencies. In the LRTP update the MPO must include a discussion of environmental mitigation strategies, or at least increase efforts to contact resource and environmental protection agencies and offer them opportunities to participate in the planning process. This next Transportation Plan update needs to adequately involve appropriate agencies and make significant strides in comparing the transportation system map to natural resource/conservation maps, plans, or inventories.

**Staff Response:** *The MPO is initiating a major update of the LRTP which will address all LRTP CAs. The expected completion is 24 months.*

## **Transportation Improvement Plan**

5. The TIP financial plan must be upgraded to include,
  - a. total project costs (i.e., full funding), or
  - b. reference to the financial element in the LRTP (assuming it is adequate)
  - c. project costs in year of expenditure dollars
  - d. Strategies which can be employed to assure future anticipated funds.

*Staff Response: The MPO staff has begun a review of the programming process documenting the planning, prioritization and programming of transportation projects, but the full scope of these changes will need to be further developed and codified within the update of the LRTP.*

6. The MPO, with its planning partners, must document the project selection criteria and process for the TIP. This project selection process should also incorporate the appropriate criteria (or actual strategies/projects) from the *Congestion Management Process*.

*Staff Response: The MPO staff has begun a review of the transportation project programming process and the strategies for selecting projects developed within the Congestion Management Process, adopted September 24, 2009, that will be incorporated in the LRTP. The CMP will be incorporated in the LRTP during the Update, 24 months.*

7. Individual projects cannot be deleted (or added) to the TIP unilaterally by the State DOT once the MPO Board takes action on the TIP. In particular,
  - a. the entire TIP (or TIP amendment) is approved by the Governor's designee for inclusion in the STIP, or the TIP or amendment is returned to the MPO for appropriate follow-up action, and
  - b. any concerns about the eligibility or funding of a project included in a TIP or TIP amendment must be resolved before the State takes final action on the formal request for action by the MPO.

*Staff Response: This is FHWA/FTA direction for the MPO and State for an on-going policy is to be considered during the update of each TIP.*

## **Congestion Management Process**

8. There is some evidence the MPO is identifying congestion in their planning process, however this is not well documented. The Congestion Management Process shall be developed in accordance with 23 CFR 450.320. The MPO shall adhere to the CMP Guidebook found at ([www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/cmpguidebook/cmpguidebook.pdf](http://www.ops.fhwa.dot.gov/publications/cmpguidebook/cmpguidebook.pdf)) for developing the Congestion Management Process.

*Staff Response: The MPO Congestion Management Process was adopted by the MPO, September 24, 2009, and will be incorporated in the LRTP during the update.*

### **Unified Planning Work Program**

9. The Unified Planning Work Program must provide more detailed descriptions of the planning products. Each of the planning products produced in a given activity needs to clearly define time frames, activity costs, associate funding sources, activity champions, and give a deadline when the public can expect a deliverable product. The current UPWP should be amended to include the work activities that address the corrective actions (and implement the Action Plan) identified as a result of this certification review.

*Staff Response: Revisions to the UPWP were initiated in the current FY 2009-2010 program and will be further refined and amended as the programming of planning projects requires.*

### **Public Participation Plan (PPP)**

10. In the 2005 certification review report, the updating of the Public Involvement Plan (PIP) was identified as a recommendation since the then and current Lincoln MPO PIP was created in December 1994. Now, it is even more crucial that the MPO updates its public involvement process to bring it into compliance with 23 CFR §450.316 (i.e. meet the requirements of a Public Participation Plan). The MPO must make certain to identify and invite stakeholders who may wish to be involved in the development of the PPP.

*Staff Response: The update of the MPO Public Participation Plan (PPP) was initiated during the summer of 2009, a Stakeholder review resulted in further plan improvements, and the MPO Technical Committee initiated the 45-day public review which was completed at the end of December 2009. The final PPP draft is under review.*

### **Planning Agreements**

11. The planning agreements need to be updated to more clearly define roles and responsibilities of the MPO and the State. Having official written agreements in place helps to ensure the 3C process is executed as intended and that it can be readily understood by the participants in the planning process and the public. The Lincoln MPO planning agreements are extremely dated and should be updated to reflect the current planning process. The planning agreements need to clearly define the MPO Planning Area Boundaries, the MPO structure, the roles and responsibilities of planning activities. This was a recommendation from the previous certification review which was not implemented.

*Staff Response: The MPO will initiate the review of the interagency MPO Planning Agreements in January 2010 with a target completion of 6 to 9 months.*

### **Metropolitan Planning Area Boundary**

12. The MPO must clearly define the Metropolitan Planning Area Boundary so all concerned parties know what areas are within that boundary. The MPA boundary descriptions shall be provided for informational purposes to FHWA and FTA. The MPA boundary descriptions

shall be submitted either as a geo-spatial database or described in sufficient detail to enable the boundaries to be accurately delineated on a map.

**Staff Response:** *The Metropolitan Planning Area Boundary (MPA) is clearly identified in the MPO Management Plan adopted September 24, 2009. The MPO will also define the MPA in the interagency MPO Planning Agreements.*

---

## **Programmatic Recommendations:**

### **Long Range Transportation Plan**

1. The LRTP should be clearly distinguished as a product developed for and through the MPO and 3-C planning process, as well as meeting needs of City/County Comprehensive Plan. To accomplish this;
  - a. the website can be restructured to better define the special role, structure, and goals of the MPO vs. the City/County-oriented planning activities, and
  - b. all documents developed through and for the MPO should be developed with this distinction in mind (with explanatory material included, if needed).

**Staff Response:** *The MPO is initiating a major update of the LRTP which will consider all the PR in the LRTP review process. The expected completion is 24 months.*

2. Transportation projects without sufficient funding expected to be available over the life of the plan may be identified as “illustrative” projects or as desired projects in a “vision” plan. If and when sufficient funding is deemed available for these projects within the life of the plan, those projects can be moved from the illustrative list or the vision plan into the fiscally constrained LRTP.

**Staff Response:** *The MPO is initiating a major update of the LRTP which will consider all the PR in the LRTP review process. The expected completion is 24 months.*

### **Travel Model Validation Efforts**

3. While the travel model has been demonstrated to produce assignment results that fall within FHWA specified standards for model calibration – based on the aggregation of volumes across facility classes -- the MPO is encouraged to conduct checks on upstream model components to ensure that they sufficiently replicate current travel demand patterns in the region. A comprehensive origin-destination (OD) survey, or perhaps several smaller surveys that capture OD geography, would help inform future year model updates/validation efforts in Lincoln and would lessen the reliance on national or ‘borrowed’ insights from other areas. In the absence of OD data, carefully designed count programs can help ‘fill in the gaps’ and offer a valuable source to extract specific travel behavior information required for the model. Reliable trip tables may also offer a

foundation for testing alternative scenarios, including those focused on alternative land development assumptions and offer the ability to provide a more complete evaluation of transportation alternatives in the Lincoln metropolitan area. Additional thought should also be given to the incorporation of sensitivity tests as a model validation strategy to examine how the model behaves as key inputs are changed.

**Staff Response:** *The MPO is updating and validating the Travel Model which will include conducting checks on upstream model components to ensure that the model accurately replicates current travel behavior and travel demand patterns in the Lincoln planning area.*

### **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)**

4. The MPO should establish the identity of the TIP as a key document of the metropolitan transportation planning process, which includes state and locally sponsored transportation projects addressing regional needs and priorities. The public should understand that the TIP is separate from the local Capital Improvement Program (CIP).
5. The TIP document should include more discussion of how the TIP implements or advances major elements of the LRTP and is an extension of the LRTP.

**Staff Response:** *The MPO has begun evaluating the necessary documentation process in prioritization and the programming of transportation system improvements. Elements of the programming process to document the planning, prioritization and programming of transportation improvement projects is expected to be included in the FY 2011-2017 TIP but the full scope of these changes will be developed and codified within the LRTP Update.*

### **Upcoming “Livability” Federal Policy/Legislative Proposals**

6. The MPO should monitor new federal policy initiatives and/or federal legislative proposals which are expected to emphasize “livability,” climate change, and related issues. It is very probable that requirements related to those issues will become more entrenched in the transportation planning process and will affect the roles and responsibilities of the MPOs, transit operators, and the State DOTs, among others.
7. The MPO and its planning partners should consider convening an environmental and community stakeholders committee or ad hoc group to be part of the identification of key issues affecting regional “livability” and environmental resources and the development of expanded livability programs and environmental mitigation strategies.

**Staff Response:** *The MPO is initiating a major update of the LRTP which will consider “Livability” issues to be included in the new Federal Policy and Legislative Proposals. The LRTP update process will involve Community stakeholders and who will be represented on a Citizen Advisory Committee. Completion of the LRTP update is expected in 24 months.*



## **Commendations:**

1. **Non-Motorized Transportation Planning** -We commend the transportation plan for providing much attention to policies applying to sidewalk, bicycle facility, and trails planning and general approaches to improving those systems within the City of Lincoln and the adjacent County areas. This should provide an excellent basis to determine how the MPO will identify, fund, and implement individual non-motorized transportation projects, either as stand alone projects or as part of larger street/highway or even transit investments.
2. **Long Range Transportation Plan Livability Policies** - We commend the transportation plan for including policies and proposed actions to maintain and improve the “livability” of the Lincoln/Lancaster County region. (This is evidenced through the strong interrelationships between land use and transportation planning and the significant attention directed to such subjects as sidewalk and trails development).
3. **Promotion of Non-Motorized Transportation and Transit** - We commend the City-County Health Department’s initiatives in the transportation planning process including the promotion of non-motorized transportation, and transit.
4. **Bicycle Parking Initiative** - We commend the development of bicycle parking, “Bicycle Corrals” with the use of funding from bicycle organization and City parking revenue
5. **Transportation Planning Outreach** -We commend the MPO’s commitment for having transportation planning outreach meetings during nontraditional times at community centers, schools, libraries and other more convenient locations for the public.
6. **Outreach to non-English Speaking Population** - We commend the MPO and StarTran for its use of the “Babble” software and for supplying translated documents upon request for non-English speaking residents of the Lincoln TMA.

**Planning Certification Review (2005)**  
**Work Plan for Addressing Programmatic Recommendations (PRs)**

<b>PR</b>	<b>Schedule</b>	<b>Staff Comments</b>	<b>Status</b>
1		<b>Evaluation of the effectiveness of the public outreach efforts.</b>	<i>resolved</i>
2	Initiate in 2010 with completion by September	<b>Perform an evaluation of the effectiveness of Environmental Justice (EJ) efforts.</b> Staff will complete an evaluation of the effectiveness of the MPO's Environmental Justice (EJ) efforts, document findings and address, as needed, future EJ action strategies.	FHWA/FTA Recommendation continues
3		<b>Consider ITS technology as an integral part of every project rather than consideration of such technology at or near the end of project design in order to meet a minimum Federal requirement.</b>	<i>resolved</i>
4	Initiate in 2010 with completion by September	<b>The MPO needs to revisit and (if needed) update the interagency planning agreements.</b> Staff will initiate the review and updating of the MPO interagency Planning Agreements.	Recommendation continues as a Corrective Action
5	Initiate with LRTP Update, this will become an on-going activity	<b>The MPO needs to proactively institute a method to gain involvement from the freight industry in the transportation planning process.</b> This is to be initiated within the LRTP Update process and maintained as a work item in the Metropolitan Transportation Planning process.	FHWA/FTA Recommendation continues
6		<b>StarTran is encouraged to develop an Access to Jobs plan and subsequently pursue and attain Access to Jobs funding from FTA.</b>	<i>resolved</i>
7		<b>The Federal government needs to provide timely information concerning available federal transportation funding to the MPO.</b>	<i>resolved</i>

**Quadrennial Certification Review (May 2009)**  
**Work Plan for Addressing Corrective Actions (CAs)**

CA	Schedule	Staff Comments	Status
1	January 2012	<b>Expand the financial element of the LRTP to address the estimated total project costs for “regionally significant” projects and other projects and programs important to the community.</b> This will be addressed in detail during the major update of the LRTP.	Included in the LRTP Update with completion in 24 months
2	January 2012	<b>The financial plan element of the LRTP must provide current and forecasted revenues available for projects. This can be included as part of the LRTP or may be summarized in the plan document with reference to more a detailed information, but separate, public document.</b> This will be addressed in detail during the major update of the LRTP.	Included in the LRTP Update with completion in 24 months
3	January 2012	<b>The LRTP is required to address environmental mitigation strategies based on consultation with natural resource, environmental, land management and similar agencies, and may include outreach activities to other environmental interest groups.</b> This will be addressed in detail during the major update of the LRTP.	Included in the LRTP Update with completion in 24 months
4	January 2012	<b>The LRTP update process must identify areas the planning process is coordinating with environmental resources agencies and include a discussion of environmental mitigation strategies. The Transportation Plan update needs to include comparisons of the transportation system with natural resource/conservation maps, plans, or inventories.</b> This will be addressed in detail in the LRTP Technical documentation during the update of the LRTP.	Included in the LRTP Update with completion in 24 months
5	January 2012	<b>The TIP financial plan must be upgraded to include:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. total project costs (i.e., full funding), or</li> <li>b. reference to the financial element in the LRTP (assuming it is adequate)</li> <li>c. project costs in year of expenditure dollars</li> <li>d. Strategies which can be employed to assure future anticipated funds.</li> </ul> Staff has begun a review of the programming process documenting the planning, prioritization and programming of transportation projects but the full scope of these changes will need to be further developed and codified within the update of the LRTP.	Staff has begun evaluating the documentation process that may be included in the FY 2011-2017 TIP, with a more detailed analysis included in the LRTP Update
6	January 2012	<b>The MPO, with its planning partners, must document the project selection criteria and process for the TIP. This project selection process should also incorporate the appropriate criteria (or actual strategies/projects) from the Congestion Management Process.</b> Staff has begun a review of the transportation project programming process and the strategies for selecting projects developed within the Congestion Management Process, adopted September 24, 2009, that will be incorporated in the LRTP.	The CMP will be incorporated in the LRTP during the Update, 24 months

7	September 2009	<p><b>Individual projects cannot be deleted (or added) to the TIP unilaterally by the State DOT once the MPO Board takes action on the TIP.</b></p> <p>This is policy direction for the MPO and State that is to be considered during the update of each TIP.</p>	On-going policy
8	January 2012	<p><b>The MPO Congestion Management Process shall be developed in accordance with 23 CFR 450.320 and documented and incorporated in the planning process.</b></p> <p>Staff has begun a review of the transportation project programming process and the strategies for selecting projects developed within the Congestion Management Process, adopted September 24, 2009, that will be incorporated in the LRTP.</p>	The CMP will be incorporated in the LRTP during the Update, 24 months
9	Completion, by July 2010	<p><b>The Unified Planning Work Program must provide more detailed descriptions of the planning products. Each of the planning products produced in a given activity needs to clearly define time frames, activity costs, associate funding sources, activity champions, and give a deadline when the public can expect a deliverable product. The current UPWP should be amended to include the work activities that address the corrective actions (and implement the Action Plan) identified as a result of this certification review.</b></p> <p>Revisions to the UPWP were initiated in the current FY 2009-10 program and further improvements to the UPWP format will be incorporated in the FY 2010-11 program. The "Action Plan" will be amended to the UPWP when approved.</p>	Revisions to the UPWP were initiated in the FY2009-2010 program, further improvements and amendments are anticipated
10	March 2010	<p><b>The MPO must update Public Participation Plan (PPP) and include stakeholders in its development to meet the requirements of 23 CFR §450.316.</b></p> <p>The update of the MPO PPP was initiated during the summer of 2009, a Stakeholder review resulted in further plan improvements, and the MPO Technical Committee initiated the 45-day public review which was completed at the end of December 2009.</p>	The draft PPP 45-day public review has been completed and the final draft is under review
11	September 2010	<p><b>The Lincoln MPO planning agreements need to be updated to more clearly define roles and responsibilities of the MPO and the State and to reflect the current planning process.</b></p> <p>Staff will initiate the review and updating of the MPO interagency Planning Agreements.</p>	Review to be initiated in January 2010
12	September 2010	<p><b>The MPO must clearly define the Metropolitan Planning Area Boundary so all concerned parties know what areas are within that boundary.</b></p> <p>The Metropolitan Planning Area Boundary (MPA) is clearly identified in the new MPO Management Plan adopted September 24, 2009. The MPO will also be defined the MPA in the interagency MPO Planning Agreements.</p>	A Map has been included in the MPO Management Plan & will be included in the Planning Agreements

**Quadrennial Certification Review (May 2009)**  
**Work Plan for Addressing Programmatic Recommendations (PRs)**

PR	Schedule	Staff Comments	Status
1	NA	<p>The LRTP should be clearly distinguished as a product developed for and through the MPO 3-C planning process, as well as meeting needs of City/County Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>To accomplish this;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the website can be restructured to better define the special role, structure, and goals of the MPO vs. the City/County-oriented planning activities, and</li> <li>b. all documents developed through and for the MPO should be developed with this distinction in mind (with explanatory material included, if needed).</li> </ul> <p>These issues are being actively considered and will be incorporated, as feasible, in all phases of the Transportation Planning and project programming process and products.</p>	On-going activity
2	January 2012	<p>Transportation projects without sufficient funding expected to be available over the life of the plan may be identified as “illustrative” projects or as desired projects in a “vision” plan. If and when sufficient funding is deemed available for these projects within the life of the plan, those projects can be moved from the illustrative list or the vision plan into the fiscally constrained LRTP.</p> <p>These issues are being actively considered and will be incorporated in the Transportation Plan during the major update of the LRTP.</p>	On-going activity
3	July 2010	<p>While the travel model has been demonstrated to produce assignment results that fall within FHWA specified standards for model calibration – based on the aggregation of volumes across facility classes -- the MPO is encouraged to conduct checks on upstream model components to ensure that they sufficiently replicate current travel demand patterns in the region. A comprehensive origin-destination (OD) survey, or perhaps several smaller surveys that capture OD geography, would help inform future year model updates/validation efforts in Lincoln and would lessen the reliance on national or ‘borrowed’ insights from other areas. In the absence of OD data, carefully designed count programs can help ‘fill in the gaps’ and offer a valuable source to extract specific travel behavior information required for the model. Reliable trip tables may also offer a foundation for testing alternative scenarios, including those focused on alternative land development assumptions and offer the ability to provide a more complete evaluation of transportation alternatives in the Lincoln metropolitan area. Additional thought should also be given to the incorporation of sensitivity tests as a model validation strategy to examine how the model behaves as key inputs are changed.</p> <p>The MPO has initiated the updating and validation of the Travel Model which will include conducting checks on upstream model components to ensure that the model accurately replicates current travel behavior and travel demand patterns in the Lincoln planning area.</p>	<p>Project scoping for the Transportation Model Update is not complete as of January 29, 2010</p> <p>The project scope and project agreements are to be approved by NDOR and executed by the City of Lincoln, and MPO in February 2010</p>

4	<p><u>Phase I</u> July 2010</p> <p><u>Phase II</u> July 2011</p> <p><u>Phase III</u> July 2012</p>	<p><b>The MPO should establish the identity of the TIP as a key document of the metropolitan transportation planning process, which includes state and locally sponsored transportation projects addressing regional needs and priorities. The public should understand that the TIP is separate from the local Capital Improvement Program (CIP).</b></p> <p>The MPO has begun evaluating the programming process for transportation system improvements that will include a clear separation of the TIP from the CIP. Elements of the programming process that document the planning, prioritization and programming of transportation improvement projects is expected to be included in the FY 2011-2017 TIP with the full scope of these changes to be further developed and codified within the current update of the LRTP.</p>	<p>On-going activity</p> <p>Will need to be considered within the LRTP Update, 24 months</p>
5	January 2012	<p><b>The TIP document should include more discussion of how the TIP implements or advances major elements of the LRTP and is an extension of the LRTP.</b></p> <p>The MPO has begun evaluating the planning and programming process for transportation system improvements which includes a discussion on project planning, prioritization and programming. The full scope of this process will be further developed and codified within the current update of the LRTP.</p>	<p>Will need to be considered within the LRTP Update, 24 months</p>
6	January 2012	<p><b>The MPO should monitor new federal policy initiatives and/or federal legislative proposals which are expected to emphasize “livability,” climate change, and related issues It is very probable that requirements related to those issues will become more entrenched in the transportation planning process and will affect the roles and responsibilities of the MPOs, transit operators, and the State DOTs, among others.</b></p> <p>The MPO is initiating a major update of the LRTP which will consider “Livability” issues being considered for the new Federal Policy and Legislative Proposals.</p>	<p>Policy issues to be considered within the LRTP Update, 24 months</p>
7	January 2012	<p><b>The MPO and its planning partners should consider convening an environmental and community stakeholders committee or ad hoc group to be part of the identification of key issues affecting regional “livability” and environmental resources and the development of expanded livability programs and environmental mitigation strategies.</b></p> <p>The MPO is initiating a major update of the LRTP which will consider “Livability” issues being considered for the new Federal Policy and Legislative Proposals.</p>	<p>Policy issues to be considered within the LRTP Update, 24 months</p>